



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

FIRST APPEAL (ST) NO.3210/2021
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 12764/2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (ST) NO. 7402/2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 16728/2023
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 16729/2023
IN
FIRST APPEAL (ST) NO.3210/2021

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR.
THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER, RAIGAD AND ANR. ..APPELLANTS
VS
GURUNATH DATTU PATIL ..RESPONDENT

Mr. A. R. Patil, Addl. G. r. for applicants-appellants – State.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATE : 12 NOVEMBER 2025.

P.C. :

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 12764/2025 IN FIRST APPEAL (ST)
NO.3210/2021

1. This application is filed to bring on record the legal heirs of the deceased respondent no. 5.
2. Office remark shows that the proposed legal heirs of deceased respondent no.5 have been duly served.
3. None appears for the proposed legal heirs of the deceased respondent no.5, when the matter is called out.

4. I have heard Mr. Patil, learned Additional Government Pleader for the State and I have gone through the documents on record. I am convinced that the present application requires to be allowed.
5. The application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a), (b), (c) and (d).
6. Amendment to be carried out within a period of four weeks from today.
7. The application is disposed of accordingly.

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 16728/2023 IN FIRST APPEAL (ST) NO.3210/2021 :-

8. This application is filed by the State for condonation of delay in filing the first appeal.
9. Office remark shows that the respondents have been duly served.
10. None appears for the respondents, when the matter is called out for hearing.
11. Supreme Court in the judgment of *Collector, Land Acquisition, Anantnag and another Vs. Mst. Katji and Others* reported in *1987 SC 1353*, has held that:

“Every day’s delay must be explained” does not mean that a pedantic approach should be made. Why not

every house's delay. Every second's delay ? The doctrine must be applied in a rational common sense pragmatic manner."

12. Supreme Court in the case of ***S. Ganesharaju (Dead) through Lrs V Narasamma (Dead) through Lrs*** reported in ***(2013) 11 SCC 341***, more specifically, paragraph Nos. 12 and 13, of the said judgment held that a liberal construction to the cause of delay should be given. The said paragraphs are reproduced herein below:

12. The expression "sufficient cause" as appearing in Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, has to be given a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice. Unless the respondents are able to show malafides in not approaching the court within the period of limitation, generally as a normal rule, delay should be condoned. The trend of the courts while dealing with the matter with regard to condonation of delay has tilted more towards condoning delay and directing the parties to contest the matter on merits, meaning thereby that such technicalities have been given go-by.

13. The rules of limitation are not meant to destroy or foreclose the right of parties. They are meant to see that parties do not resort to dilatory tactics but seek their remedy promptly.

13. Bombay High Court in the judgment of ***Kamalbai Narasaiyya Shrimal and Another Vs. Ganpat Vithalrao Gavare*** reported in ***2007 (1) MH. L.J. 807***, paragraph Nos.13 and 15 has held:

13. The factual position is manifestly clear on bare perusal of the application for condonation filed by the

petitioners before the learned District Judge. The only relevant statement in the application is thus:

“The delay caused in preferring the appeal is of six months. The caused delay is not intentional one. The appellants are poor and helpless persons. If the delay is not condoned appellant may cause irreparable loss which cannot be compensated in terms of money. The suit was for recovery of possession and present appellants are tenants. If the delay is not condoned then appellants will become shelterless.”

15. The expression “sufficient cause” cannot be erased from section of the Limitation Act by adopting excessive liberal approach which would defeat the very purpose of section 5 of the Limitation Act. There must be some cause which can be termed as a sufficient one for the purpose of delay condonation. I do not find any such “sufficient cause” stated in the application and as such no interference in the impugned order is called for.”

14. I have heard Mr. Patil, learned Additional Government Pleader for the State and I have gone through the documents on record. I am convinced that the present application requires to be allowed.

15. The application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b) and disposed of accordingly.

FIRST APPEAL (ST) NO.3210/2021:-

16. Heard Mr. Patil, learned Additional Government Pleader for the State.

17. Admit.

18. The appellants to file private paper-book within one year from

today. A copy of the same to be served on other side.

19. Soft copy of R & P be sent by the trial Court to the High Court within 4 weeks from today. Original R & P should be preserved by the trial Court till further orders of this Court. Original R & P to be sent to the High Court when called for.

20. Parties to file a compilation of document, short synopsis along with their preposition of law and authorities relied upon by them within one week from today.

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 16729/2023 IN FIRST APPEAL (ST) NO.3210/2021 :

21. This application is filed by the State seeking stay to the impugned judgment and award dated 4 May 2019.

22. Heard learned Additional Government Pleader Mr. Patil appearing for the State.

23. Subject to the State depositing the entire award amount alongwith accrued interest within a period of twelve weeks from today in the Reference Court, there will be stay to the execution of the Judgment and Award dated 4 May 2019.

(Rajesh S. Patil, J.)